Vol. X, No. 12 HUMAN EVENTS March 25, 1953

LEFTWARD HO!

By E. MERRILL ROOT

UNIVERSITY OF MI
APR
7
53

MOST American professors in American colleges are still sane. But this Right-minded majority is too often dexterous only in the Latin sense of "right-handed", not in the English sense of "clever-handed": it has allowed itself to be caricatured and betrayed by a sinister minority, militant and hypervocal. This minority is a motley group composed of a few *very powerful* Russia Firsters; a larger body of hitchhiking totalitarian "liberals" with a Messianic complex and vocal delirium tremens; and a still larger hodgepodge of fuzzy-minded and sentimental spinsters of the mind, who begin by defending a Communist's "right" to his "views" and end by defending (vaguely but passionately) the views themselves.

This unholy trinity — the many who know not what they do led by the few who know too well what they do — has muddied the good name of professor. We who think otherwise, therefore, must stop playing dummy for such blatant ventriloquism, and speak for ourselves — thus becoming, in English as well as in Latin, the *dexterous* majority.

So let us listen to three professors who tell us, as only professors can, what goes on in American colleges, thus preparing ourselves better to counter the sinister minority.

I BEGIN WITH AN OBSERVER from abroad, a witness from the firing-line of freedom. Such is the Ukrainian scholar, Professor Roman Smal-Stocki, who has served freedom in the face of a concentration camp. Having fought for freedom where the iron hoof of Communism tramples, he has won the right to speak. He now teaches at Marquette University, whence he surveys the academic scene steadily, and sees — as only a free spirit can — too many professors who believe that Leftward the land seems bright.

Professor Smal-Stocki has written a scholarly book, *The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union and Russian Communist Imperialism* (The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin). In his brave and brilliant *Introduction,* Professor Smal-Stocki tells what he and his coexiles and fellow-fighters against slavery discover in too many American colleges. It is an indictment that should rout the Gulliberals like a terrible swift sword.

He writes: "In the course of the past decades we had not received, in our fight for academic freedom in the Soviet Union, one single spontaneous word of encouragement

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the American Universities; on the contrary, many books of American scholars glorified the regime which killed academic freedom, independent thought and all free intellectual creation."

He continues: "We found here in the U.S.A. a scientific Iron Curtain, with the emblem of a 'red herring', regarding all matters connected with the Soviet Union, and a very active staff of a 'Soviet-Russian occupation zone' in American intellectual and academic life. These facts explain for us the kind of censorship and thought control which exists especially in the American liberal press and and converts this country into an intellectual colony of the Soviet- or Pan-Russian ideology. Some of the DP professors, after a couple of months in the U.S.A., had the feeling that they were trapped here by Stalin's 'Second Front' against the fight for academic freedom. . . ."

He writes of "Soviet bandwagon intellectuals (who) by their pseudo-sophistication created in some classes and on campuses this moral and cultural vacuum into which the Russian Communist pest penetrated, infecting youth . . .; these teachers have propagandized on their campuses amongst successive groups of American youth a sloganized 'leftist' thinking of a deadly mediocrity, with a worship of the authoritarian stars of Marx and Lenin, and of everything 'Soviet Russian' as 'social progress'; they are still creating that climate of thought, that 'Soviet Russia worship' and 'Russia mania', barring all objective research, and fostering the opinion among American university professors that a certain 'fellow-travellerism', of many different shades, is an absolutely necessary make-up for any scholar in the U.S.A. who wishes to be regarded as a 'progressive' or 'liberal'." And this could not (he says) "have happened by chance", but only as a result of careful planning and clever infiltration by clear-minded enemies, because "the U.S.A. constitutes for Russian Communism the chief target and last obstacle".

Here are the words of a man who has himself fought the Blatant Beast hand to hand! Will professors not listen before it is too late, and break with the "band-wagon intellectuals", and cease their mad games of Russian roulette before they blow America's brains out?

And remember that Professor Smal-Stocki is a distinguished professor in a great American university — certainly no enemy of colleges and no traitor to professors! — who speaks in brave defense of academic freedom.

LISTEN TO A SECOND WITNESS from the ranks of the professors. Professor H. A. Hobbs of the University of Pennsylvania has recently written a cool, impartial, incisive book, which he quietly entitles: *The Claims of Sociology: a Critique of Textbooks* (Stackpole Company, Harrisburg, Pa.). It is a *must* for all who seek the truth. Examining the texts

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of sociology dominant in American schools and colleges, Professor Hobbs discovers a curious slant and bias: a constant conformity to an orthodoxy of radicalism like a ground swell sending every wave in a single direction. The relation of sociology to economics is symptomized by the remark he quotes from a well-accepted textbook: "The nearest approach to individualism that is opposed to collectivism is found in certain types of insanity."*

"These texts" (he says) "are definitely critical of the existing economic system. . . . Most texts criticize private competitive enterprise as it functions in a capitalistic economy." There are no equal criticisms of Collectivism.

About marriage, the family, education, religion, social change and controls, Professor Hobbs finds bias toward the pseudo-progressive, the secular, the pragmatic; economic determinism is assumed as a paramount dynamic; emphasis on panaceas of the Left is universal. He says (p. 176): "The sociological point of view is 'humanitarian' if this term involves lamentation about war, economic maldistribution, and individual unhappiness. It appears, however, to be secular, materialistic, short-term humanitarianism. It is 'liberal', if this term applies to doctrinaire criticisms of economic maldistribution, of inequalities between sexes, and of social controls. It is not liberal, however, if this term implies a tolerant historical perspective and a balanced and unbiased presentation of controversial issues in society." He proves that sociological textbooks indulge in shameful and shameless pleading for the Left.

And remember that Professor Hobbs himself is a distinguished professor in a great American university — certainly no enemy of colleges and no traitor to professors! — who speaks in behalf of objectivity and liberalism.

FOR MY FINAL witness to the bias toward collectivism in American colleges, I go to the distinguished *Vassar Alumnae Magazine.* In the issue for February, 1950, Professor Edna C. Macmahon, Associate Professor of Economics, wrote an article entitled: "Did You Major in Economics?" She knows, as few others can, the nature of economics at Vassar, and I take her word unquestioningly.

She first praises Keynes with a lush delight (restrained by the usual Vassar abstract intellectualism); all the younger economists, in spite of *obiter dicta* criticisms of him, regard him as primary and great. Then she gets down to brass tacks. Economics today, she says, is grouped around a comparative study of the practices of systems. Which of these systems are worth study? (If you are incredulous, go read page eleven!) Students of

---

* Quoted from *Social Pathology,* L. G. Brown, P. 76 of Hobbs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economics at Vassar are to study pre-war German Fascism, Russian Communism, British Socialism; then comes an awkward hiatus. Professor Macmahon gives a left-handed compliment to free enterprise, even while ignoring it; so much emphasis has been given to socialism that some have questioned whether or not "laissez faire is now the only Utopia left untried". Yet there seems no further concession to capitalism. I vainly search for capitalism listed as a subject worthy of the study given so eagerly to its anti-theses.

Vassar students, I am bewildered into believing, are isolated from the system wherein, willynilly, they live — except as it comes in critically through the study of various collectivist spasms. Maybe (I conclude) Vassar students will enter the world as ignorant of the facts of economic life as Victorian girls were supposed to be about the facts of sex. At least it seems that, by the testimony of an unimpeachable witness, in at least one American college the collected collectivisms are paramount.

And remember that Professor Macmahon is herself a distinguished professor in a great American college — certainly no enemy of colleges and no traitor to professors! — who at least wishes to speak for academic freedom.

SUCH, THREE WITNESSES prove, is the tendency of the sinister minority in American Education to dominate a majority that does not seem to be dexterous enough to cope with it. And now just one more witness — this time a witness to the ruin of the undergraduate mind which logically follows from such perversions.

In the *Amherst Alumni News* (October, 1952), Robert McAfee Brown, a graduate of the class of 1943, is publicly "worried". Why? Because the Amherst student may not shuffle off the coil of conservatism and transcend "the outlook and viewpoints and prejudices which he has inherited from Papa and Westchester". If so, "Amherst has failed". Mr. Brown insists that Junior must be taught to deny that two plus two equals four (a "prejudice from Papa"), just so that he may be in dearer consonancy with Keynes. It worries Mr. Brown also lest the collegiate orthodoxy be fractured by heretics and free thinkers like William Buckley and Senator McCarthy. "The McCarthys and the Buckleys" (says orthodox Mr. Brown) "worry me very much indeed." He even defines our day — the party line in academic America — as "the Era of McCarthy".

Rebecca West, a much wiser and more travelled mind, has named our age somewhat differently. She calls it "The Age of Treason". And in this conflict between Mr. Brown and Rebecca West, do we not see in symbol what is wrong with American colleges? They still indoctrinate and parrot the false cliché that this is "the Era of McCarthy", too spiritually illiterate to realize that this is — *the Age of Alger Hiss!*

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* — FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 12 — Wednesday, March 25, 1953 — Washington, D. C.

APR 7 '53

The Riddle of Defense: The burning $64 question in Washington is — Will Ike change America's defense strategy?

This is the issue behind the various stories in the past fortnight suggesting that the U.S.A. is terribly vulnerable to Russian air attack, that we're short of ammunition, that Britain won't help us fight in Europe, etc., etc.

What it all comes down to is that the strategy of mass ground warfare, as planned by the preceding Administration, just is not working out; and that the slow cerebral activities in the Pentagon are directed toward another grand consideration of our whole military policy, such as nearly came to pass when Truman fired MacArthur.

What Ike faces is collapse of the projected European army system, with Britain pulling out of plans to defend the Continent by ground forces. Such events would appear to leave Ike — who has backed these plans — figuratively with no place to go. But that is not exactly true.

It is a little remembered fact that five days before the November election, Candidate Eisenhower made some exceedingly surprising remarks in a speech given in the Bronx in New York. He said, referring to his promise to visit Korea, that "we must prepare the Koreans to defend their own lines, as we have done elsewhere, so that American forces can serve their true purpose. That is to be the great mobile reserve of the free world and to provide air and sea support whenever and wherever needed." (Our emphasis.)

The terminology — "air and sea" — which he used was lost on the public in the noisy forensics of the last days of the campaign. But it was not lost on military observers who noted its identity with what had been known as the "air-sea" strategy outlined by Herbert Hoover, Senator Taft and — not least — General Douglas MacArthur. What else could this mean unless Ike had reversed his previous military strategy (fighting the enemy principally by a mass ground army) and had accepted the strategy urged by the conservative leaders of his own party?

Whatever his intention, his Bronx statement does allow him "some place to go" in the present defense crisis. In fact, if he were to drop the Truman strategy of fighting the war with bayonets against overwhelming Russian infantry forces, he would find ready at hand a strategy which has been urged not only by the Air Force, by Taft, Hoover and MacArthur, but also by Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Britain, and the British military leaders.

On January 7, HUMAN EVENTS was the first to break the news that this was the line of thinking of British military chiefs, when they talked to our top brass. Subsequently, the same intelligence leaked out in the American daily and periodical press — that the British wanted to design world defense on the "air concept", so long urged by Douglas MacArthur. In a recent issue of *Fortune* magazine, Charles J. V. Murphy discusses approvingly this British plan for global defense, based on the atom bomb delivered by long-range ground-based aircraft — the only effective "deterrent" to Soviet aggression.

What the *Fortune* writer does not reveal is that the British "air concept" plan was submitted by the British last fall to the American Joint Chiefs of Staff, and was summarily rejected. Ike, then campaigning for election, had no part in this rejection. His statement in the Bronx speech — that the true purpose of American forces "is to be the great mobile reserve of the free world and to provide air and sea support" — stands as an open door for him to enter.

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If he should take such a course, the results would have vast repercussions — one of which would be the solution to his most pressing governmental problems. Recently a Treasury official of the out-going Democratic administration remarked to us — "The budget cannot be balanced, and taxes cannot be reduced, unless the basic military strategy is changed. If that is contemplated — then an entirely different fiscal situation looms."

Thunder Over Bohlen: *L'affaire* Bohlen and the preceding business of the so-called "repudiation of Yalta" has stirred up intense atmospheric disturbances in the political situation. Observers here believe that the thunder and lightning presage a storm which will have profound effects on the stability of the new regime. And some Republicans, who have been privately wondering if the Party will lose the Congressional elections of 1954, now show increased concern.

Two developments have accentuated this anxiety — revolt among the Polish-Americans, and signs that the German-Americans are, to say the least, disgruntled.

GOP experts, who worked on "minority" groups during the campaign with no little success, have sent warnings to the National Committee and the White House that the Poles are "up in arms". In the Polish language press — led by seven dailies — indignation is expressed at Dulles' attempt to get an endorsement of the Yalta Pact (regarded by Polish-Americans as the greatest crime of the Roosevelt foreign policy). And the insistence of Dulles on the appointment of Bohlen, one of the architects of Yalta, has further raised this minority's anger.

In the *New World* (New York), in *Everybody's Daily* (Detroit), in *Alliance News* (Chicago) and other Polish language papers, the phrase is used: "Bohlen is the grave-digger of Poland". Dulles' effort in alliance with the Democrats to put over the endorsement of Yalta is labelled "the worst double-cross since Roosevelt". The fact that Eisenhower categorically pledged repudiation of Yalta in what the Polish-Americans know as the Denver Declaration (see HUMAN EVENTS, February 25) seems to Poles the "betrayal of the century".

This is not the harmless squalling of a negligible "minority". In the GOP National Committee after the election, it was estimated that the Denver Declaration helped to cause a shift of a very large number of votes in key states from the Democratic ticket (traditionally the party of the Poles) to the Republican ticket. Experts say that for the first time in history, a majority of the Poles voted for the Republican candidate for President. To put it mildly, these folk are not happy now.

Nor is that all. The second development concerns the German-American community. Last week, the *Steuben News*, an organ of this group, ran a front page editorial severely assailing the Eisenhower foreign policy. That paper accuses the Eisenhower Administration of "not keeping faith with the German people who voted Eisenhower into the White House", and alludes ironically to "campaign oratory" after referring to pledges to repudiate the Yalta and Potsdam pacts. Nor is the German-American group to be despised. Mr. Samuel Lubell, author of *The Future of American Politics*, writing in the *Saturday Evening Post* on January 10, "Who Elected Eisenhower?", relates in some geographical detail the important election role played by this group.

Today, political observers emphasize the risks to the Republican Party. Yet, Dulles insists on the appointment of Bohlen. What for? The issue of Bohlen need not enter into what lies in that controversial FBI file on the gentleman. It need concern not much more than what is in his own official biography in *Who's Who:*

"Accompanied Sec. of State to Moscow Conf., 1943; attended Teheran Conf., 1943; 1st Sec., Moscow, Nov. 1942-Jan. 1944; chief Div. Eastern European Affairs, 1944; area adviser, U.S. Group Dumbarton Oaks Conversations on Internat. Orgn., Washington 1944; Asst. to Sec. of State for White House Liaison, 1944; accompanied Pres. Roosevelt to Crimea Conf., 1945 [Yalta]." In short, Mr. Bohlen was a big wheel in the machinery which produced the disastrous policy of appeasing our Soviet co-belligerent. He

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is proposed — nay insisted upon — as new Ambassador to Moscow, perhaps to deal with peace negotiations. To make another Yalta? In view of the record, more than the minority groups are justified in asking — why?

Watch for: In the Department of the Interior, intense discussion springs from hitherto unpublished news that former President Herbert Hoover will soon make a speech on the subject of electric power. How he will deal with TVA, regional dams, power plants and hydroelectric projects are matters of great interest to Secretary McKay and his aides. It is believed that the new Secretary of Interior will pursue a policy quite different from the socialistic philosophy of his predecessor, Mr. Oscar Chapman.

● Secretary Ezra Benson's department is studying a revolutionary scheme to wean the farmer away from price supports, and a decision may be made public soon. The plan is one of "price insurance", premiums to be paid by the individual farmer on an actuarial basis and protection to be given against wide fluctuations of agricultural prices. Private insurance companies may participate, but the scheme is regarded as so vast in scope that in all probability the Government would have to financially underwrite it, at least in the initial stages.

Baseball: Two events of an earth-shattering nature occurred in these United States last week. The Braves were moved out of Boston, where they had resided for three-quarters of a century, and into the Milwaukee hinterland; the Browns of St. Louis were refused permission by the American Baseball League to move their franchise to Baltimore. The City Fathers of the four cities took official cognizance of these events, and the Honorable Mr. Emanuel Celler, Representative from the State of New York, voiced his opinion on the matter and promised to bring it up in the House.

It so happens that professional baseball has remained, in spite of the efforts of the politicos to correct the evil, a free enterprise business. Those who engage in it, from players to owners, do so for profit, just like manufacturers and farmers. That is to say, when the people vote for their teams — by buying tickets for the games — the entrepreneurs gain; but, when they stay away, losses are inevitable. The people of Boston and St. Louis "voted against" their respective teams quite decidedly; they said, by their absence, "go away, we don't want you". So, the owners decided to abide by the decision of these free-willing citizens. What else could they do?

They could — and perhaps Mr. Celler has this in mind — apply to the government for "parity" prices or some other form of handout. Why not? Everybody is doing it, and why should baseball be the forgotten business? Perhaps the peoples of Boston and St. Louis who stayed away from their respective ball parks should write their Congressmen to compel the owners to accept the taxpayers' money, in order that they might continue their unwanted exhibitions in these cities. That would be in line with the newly established American policy of shoring up incompetence. Of course, as a condition for this support, the President should be empowered to regulate the selection of pitchers, as well as to instruct umpires on how to properly distribute victories and defeats. The teams would have to bow to these decisions, just as farmers who depend on help from the Government must abide by its rules and regulations.

Baseball is still a benighted industry; it is outside the sphere of the Welfare State.

Note on McCarthy: The tilt between Dulles and McCarthy over the FBI file on Bohlen very naturally led to the usual literary lynching of the Wisconsin Senator by the usual newspapers and their editorial writers. One episode particularly inspired these scribes to verbal hysterics. McCarthy proposed that Bohlen be given the lie-detector test. We heard several times in the past year that the lie-detector test has been used by the State Department in some cases involving "security risks", so our blood pressure did not rise above normal. Today, we checked with a State Department official who replied: "What you have heard is correct."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Containment or Liberation? by James Burnham. New York. The John Day Company. $3.50. Reviewed by Isaac Don Levine.

Stalin's death is at last putting to the acid test America's containment policy toward the Soviet Union. The publication at this time of James Burnham's *Containment or Liberation?* should prove a Godsend to President Eisenhower's crew of advisers on psychological warfare in their quest of a blueprint for a positive American foreign policy.

For seven years the United States has pursued a policy without a goal, the policy of containment, which, "stripped bare", as Mr. Burnham so well puts it, "is simply the bureaucratic verbalization of a policy of drift". It was more than that — it was a rationalization of a profound sense of guilt on the part of a coterie of bureaucratic intellectuals of the Harry Hopkins school who led us to the shameful and needless surrender at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. That coterie made a cult of George Kennan's literary exercises in diplomacy, and with the help of a corps of inspired Washington writers represented the frail containment policy as a veritable dam of statesmanship.

In the opening three chapters of his book, Mr. Burnham, with superb skill and incisiveness, demolishes the cult of containment and clears the ground for a sound framework of a new American foreign policy. With incontestable logic and an array of facts, he exposes the fakes and the myths which have mushroomed around the operations of the policy of containment, from our blunders in Korea to our costly Pyrrhic triumphs in European rehabilitation and rearmament.

The essence of the containment policy, Mr. Burnham points out, is the assumption that the Communist dictatorship will mellow and change its character in time to make it a fit member of a decent community of nations. Such an assumption is at best a pious hope. The truth of the matter is that Woodrow Wilson was the first to experiment with a policy of containment, when under the influence of George Kennan's predecessor, Raymond Robins, the evangelical diplomat, he sent his message to the Bolshevist Congress of Soviets in 1918. But at that early stage there was at least good reason for pious hopes. The Harry Hopkins school of diplomacy learned nothing from the immense and bitter experience which the world has had with Bolshevism since then.

Mr. Burnham is, of course, an ardent believer in dynamic political warfare as "the only alternative to unlimited nuclear war", but with ample reason doubts the capacity of our national leadership to wage a victorious cold war. He sees victory in a policy of liberation, the goal of which "is freedom for the peoples and nations now enslaved by the Russian-centered Soviet system — freedom for all the peoples and nations now under Communist domination, including the Russian people".

There are anti-Communist elements, notably Ukrainian extremists, who have made much of Mr. Burnham's past writings in their endeavors to foist upon America, in the guise of liberation, a policy of fighting for the establishment of an independent Ukraine or Byelorussia or Transcaucasia. These elements overlook the fact that Americans will fight against Communist imperialism only until it ceases to be an aggressive threat to our national security and to the peace of the world. Mr. Burnham's present position that it would not "be proper at any time for America to try to prescribe in detail the political and social arrangements that will replace the Soviet state system" will come as a shock to this lobby of Ukrainian separatists and their American sympathizers.

In *Containment or Liberation?* Mr. Burnham has produced another challenging work which attests once more to his being one of the very few prime political thinkers on the almost barren landscape of American statesmanship today.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED